

Reprinted from CANDOUR

LEARNED
ELDERS
AND
THE B.B.C.

by
A. K. CHESTERTON

Britons Publishing Society

From C A N D O U R

9 June 1961

The Learned Elders and the B.B.C.

As the B.B.C. in its wisdom or lack of it has devoted an entire peak listening hour to the subject of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, an opportunity would seem to be offered to Candour to add a few comments to the discussion, and perhaps furnish a corrective for some of the more flagrant excesses of Broadcasting House propaganda, which such an event naturally incubates. Its Director-General, Hugh Carleton Greene, having declared that the B.B.C. would never be neutral where Jewish interests were involved, nobody should have been surprised to discover that the aim of the programme was not merely to present the Protocols of Zion as a forgery but to have them uttered as the melodramatic ravings of a maniac. Whatever may be their origin, the thought behind the Protocols is cool and clear, so that, in attempting to discredit them as "*The Great Lie*", Broadcasting House itself is seen to be by no means unversed in the dishonourable arts of *suggestio falsi*.

Outright Lying

Indeed, the programme contained some outright lying. For instance, this concerning the Berne trial of some young men who had been charged with distributing the Protocols as indecent literature (which in the pornographic sense they certainly are not): "*The fact that the Protocols were indeed a complete forgery was pronounced fully proved by the court in Berne and later by the court of appeal in Geneva.*" The court of appeal made no such pronouncement. Nor was it, to the best of my knowledge a Geneva court, but the Berne Cantonal Tribunal. The Tribunal reversed the magistrate's finding (about the fact of indecent literature) and ruled that the question of the authenticity of the Protocols was entirely irrelevant. It added that on this subject it rejected the conclusions of both sides. That, as it happens, is my own position and the position of most other students of the Jewish problem.

When first I read the explanation of Nilus made in 1905, as to how he came by the documents, the thought occurred to me that the evidence was pretty thin and unsatisfactory, not to be accepted without confirmation which in fact has never been forthcoming, and that is still my view. Never for one moment did I suppose that the teachings which they contain were delivered to a Zionist Congress in Basle in 1897, or any other year, by Theodore Herzl. Dr. Herzl, as the Jews rightly affirm, was not that kind of man, although there is evidence that he did not have an uncanny sense of the shape of things to come. But when I later read Jewish attempts to disprove the authenticity of the Protocols my critical faculty was even less satisfied than it had been by the evidence of Nilus, and as for last week's B.B.C. "*exposure*" — it stank to Heaven of mendacity.

The truth is that nobody now living knows for certain when and where the Protocols originated, and sensible people don't care a damn. Broadcasting House, indubitably at the instance of Jewry, made a great mistake when it decided to arrange a programme on the subject, and it may have been a recognition of this fact that led it, in the event, to turn the

whole thing into a boisterous melodrama overstepping the bounds of farce. This in turn was also a mistake, for if the Protocols were nothing more than the ravings of a maniac, why should the Jews make repudiation of them so desperately serious a task and why should the B.B.C. devote a whole peak listening hour to the subject?

Because the voice entrusted with speaking the text of the Protocols frequently rose from comically hissing, sibilant whispers to frantic shrieks, thoughtful people with attentive minds must surely soon have surmised that a deliberate attempt was being made to guy or obscure the meaning and therefore would have listened all the more determinedly to the actual words. The event, indeed, was yet another instance of an almost insane overplaying of the Jewish hand. Whatever the effect intended, the effect contrived was one of sustained special pleading and deadly venom.

It is, with submission, impossible for any intelligent person, aware of what is happening in the world, to read or listen to the reading of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion without being astounded by their prophetic insight, their knowledge of the weaknesses in Gentile society, their proposed techniques for exploiting those weaknesses, and their adumbration of the methods of securing policy objectives which have either been achieved or are on the eve of achievement. I write "adumbration", because although the spirit animating the Protocols survives intact, the actual mechanisms at the disposal of the policymakers have progressed far beyond the imagination of the "*Elders of Zion*", whoever they may have been. For example, the B.B.C. itself! The B.B.C. as a weapon is better than hunger. Subtle though the authors of the Protocols were, their successors have in radio and television the means of much greater subtlety. For that reason, perhaps, we should be grateful to Broadcasting House for unconsciously offsetting some of its perpetual poisoning of the public ear by a programme which broke all the rules and of which the "*Learned Elders*" would scarcely have approved. This kind of action, like the Eichmann trial, is the recurring madness of the Jew.

Let me quote some passages from the Protocols, passages the meaning and significance of which cannot be altogether destroyed even by a voice imported by the B.B.C. to suggest gibbering insanity. Here is one which describes a policy end and some part of the means of securing it:

"What form of administrative rule can be given to communities in which corruption has penetrated everywhere, communities where riches are attained only by the clever surprise tactics of semi-swindling tricks; where looseness reigns: where morality is maintained by penal measures and harsh laws but not by voluntarily accepted principles: where the feeling toward faith and country are obliterated by cosmopolitan convictions?"

What form of rule is to be given to these communities if not that despotism which I shall describe to you later? We shall create an intensified centralisation of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences and liberties which have been permitted by the goyim, and our kingdom will be distinguished by a despotism of such magnificent proportions as to be at

any moment and in every place in a position to wipe out any goyim who oppose by deed or word...

Moreover, the art of directing masses and individuals by means of cleverly manipulated theory and verbiage, by regulations of life-in-common and all sorts of other quirks, in all which the goyim understand nothing, belong likewise to the specialists of our administrative brain..."

What is this if not the definition long before 1917 of an objective attained by the Bolshevik regime? Mr. Sydney Salomon, of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, once attacked me with vehemence in the Journal of the Institute of Journalists because I had drawn attention to the Judaic inspiration of, and participation in, that regime.

Authoritative Voice

Yet we have the evidence of a voice more authoritative than my own. *"It would seem almost as if the gospel of Christ and the gospel of anti-Christ were destined to originate among the same people, and that this mystic and mysterious race had been chosen for the supreme manifestations of the divine and diabolical... From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kuhn (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstruction of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Nesta Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognisable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire. There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others."* The author of that passage was none other than Winston Spencer Churchill, writing in the Illustrated Sunday Herald of February 8, 1920. Churchill has no doubt the best of reasons for long ago banishing such truths from his mind.

"Envious malevolence and impossible equality"! The *"Learned Elders"* also speak of these matters.

"The weapons in our hands are limitless ambitions, burning greediness, merciless vengeance, hatred and malice".

But they understand well enough, and state with frankness that the concept of *"equality"* is also among their weapons.

"In all corners of the earth the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were canker-worms at work boring into the well-being of the goyim, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity, and destroying all the foundations of the goya states. As you will see later, this helped us to our triumph: it gave us the possibility, among other things, of getting into our hands the master-card — the destruction of the privileges, or in other words of the very existence, of the aristocracy of the goyim, that class which was the only defence peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the natural and genealogical aristocracy of the goyim we have set up the aristocracy of our educated classes, headed by the aristocracy of money".

If that, to the mind of Hugh Carleton Greene, is the raving of a lunatic I can only remark that there is method in it, and little truth!

Economic Warfare

The part played by economic warfare and the manipulation of money is stressed repeatedly in the Protocols:

"We shall soon begin to establish huge monopolies, reservoirs of colossal riches, upon which even large fortunes of the goyim will be dependent to such an extent that they will go to the bottom together with the credit of the States on the day after the political smash... The aristocracy of the goyim, as a political force, is dead... but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential, therefore, for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens upon landed property — in loading lands with debts. These measures will check land-holding and keep it in a state of humble and unconditional submissions...

What we want is that industry should drain off from the land both labour and capital and by speculation transfer into our hands all the money in the world, and thereby throw all the goyim into the ranks of the proletariat... To complete the ruin of the industry of the goyim we shall bring to the assistance of speculation and luxury which we have developed among the goyim, that greedy demand for luxury which is swallowing up everything. We shall raise the rate of wages, which, however will not bring any advantage to the workers for, at the same time, we shall produce a rise in prices of the first necessities of life... We shall further undermine artfully and deeply sources of production, by accustoming the workers to anarchy and to drunkenness, and side by side therewith taking all measures to extirpate from the face of the earth all the educated forces of the goyim. In order that the true meaning of things may not strike the goyim before the proper time, we shall mask it under an alleged ardent desire to serve the working classes and the great principles of political economy about which our economic theorists are carrying on an energetic propaganda".

Quite a number of current trends and developing policies are taken care of in that passage — take-over bids, the rationalization schemes of P.E.P. and Harold Macmillan launched in the 'thirties, the latter's election-boast of more and more T.V. sets, washing-machines and refrigerators, galloping inflation, reckless wage claims, the attack on the land, the Socialist masquerade as class-warriors, the recent formation of people's trusts, the destruction of traditional leadership.

Nor are the Protocols silent about the need to bedevil the public mind by confusionist tactics.

"In order to put public opinion in our hands we must bring it into a state of bewilderment by giving expression from all sides to so many contradictory opinions and for such length of time as will suffice to make the goyim lose their heads in the labyrinth and come to see that the best thing is to have no opinion of any kind in matters political, which it is not given to the public to understand, because they are understood only by him who guides the public. This is the first secret".

Nobody who has endeavoured to persuade people of the dangers confronting them in this disastrous age can fail to pay tribute to the thoroughness with which the job of disorientating public opinion has been performed. Then there is the second secret:

"The second secret requisite for the success of our government is comprised in the following: To multiply to such an extent national failings, habits, passions, conditions of civil life, that it will be impossible for anyone to know where he is in the resulting chaos, so that the people in consequence will fail to understand one another. This measure will also serve us in another way, namely, to sow discord in all parties, to dislocate all collective forces which are still unwilling to submit to us, and to discourage any kind of personal initiative which might in any degree hinder our affair.

There is nothing more dangerous than personal initiative: if it has genius behind it, such initiative can do more than can be done by millions of people among whom we have sown discord. We must so direct the education of the goyim communities that whenever they come upon a matter requiring initiative they may drop their hands in despairing impotence".

Yes, we can also confirm that success in applying the second secret is apparent in every department of contemporary life, even to the extent of so confounding and mentally caponizing the people that in the United Kingdom they allow tens of thousands of coloured immigrants, many of them evil, to pour into their country every year, in the Rhodesias they prepare the way for Black domination and in Kenya they get ready to flee before the onrush of enfranchised savagery. They have all been mentally bludgeoned out of the use of their wits.

Corrupting Youth

The "*Learned Elders*" believe in starting the corrupting process early:

"We have fooled, bemused and corrupted the youth of the goyim by rearing them in principles and theories which are known to us to be false although it is by us that they have been inculcated..."

In order to effect the destruction of all collective forces except ours, we shall emasculate the first stage of collectivism — the universities, by re-educating them in a new direction. Their officials and professors will be prepared for their business by detailed secret programmes of action from which they will not for a moment with immunity diverge, not by one iota. They will be appointed with especial precaution and will be so placed as to be wholly dependent upon the Government...

The ill-guided acquaintance of a large number of persons with questions of policy creates Utopian dreamers and bad subjects, as you can see for yourselves from the example of the universal education in this direction of the goyim. We must introduce into their education all those principles which have so brilliantly broken up their order. But when we are in power we shall remove every kind of disturbing subject from the course of education and shall make out of the youth obedient children of authority, loving him who rules as the support and hope of peace and quiet".

How many universities in the world escape this reconditioning? Pretoria, perhaps. And Stellenbosch. But neither, I would say, for very long.

Then the "Elders" turn their minds to the intelligentsia:

"The part played by the liberals, Utopian dreamers, will be finally played out when our government is acknowledged. Till such time they will continue to do us good service. Therefore we shall continue to direct their minds to all sorts of vain conceptions of fantastic theories, new and apparently progressive: for have we not with complete success turned the brainless heads of the goyim with progress, till there is not among the goyim one mind able to perceive that under this word lies a departure from truth in all cases where it is not a question of material inventions, for truth is one, and in it there is no place for progress. Progress, like a fallacious idea, serves to obscure truth so that none may know it except us..."

When we come into our kingdom our orators will expound great problems which have turned humanity upside down in order to bring it at the end under our beneficent rule. Who will ever suspect then that all these peoples were stage-managed by us according to a political plan which no one has so much as guessed at in the course of many centuries?"

Well, certainly the optimists who run the *New Statesman*, the *Spectator* and other such papers have no suspicion whatever that the haze of unreality which surrounds them and their readers had its predetermined end.

The Objective

What, to use a colloquialism, are all these plottings of the "Elders" in aid of? They themselves supply the answer:

"By all these means we shall so wear down the goyim that they will be compelled to offer us international power of a nature that will enable us without violence gradually to absorb all the State forces of the world and to form a Super-Government. In place of the rulers of today we shall set up a bogey which will be called the Super-Government Administration. Its hands will reach out in all directions like nippers and its organisation will be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the nations of the world."

There it is — World Government. What are the Common Market, Euratom, the Coal and Steel Community, NATO, SEATO, the Soviet empires, the United Nations, if they are not either steps or alternative lines of approach to One World — a Jew-dominated world?

In truth, however, we do not need the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion to tell us of these things, which form part of what is now declared policy, further by pressures no longer altogether concealed. I have never based any part of Candour's case on the Protocols, for the simple reason that I know nothing of their origin and care less. What interests me, and what calls forth my own fighting spirit, is what I have discerned of the organised use of evil to subvert Western civilisation and bring our traditional values crashing to the ground so that a totally different, a blood-chilling and hateful, influence may henceforward dominate the world. The Protocols may be fake, a fabrication, call them what you will. But they are not, as the B.B.C. presented them, mad, in the sense of being divorced from the realities of subversion and revolution. Lacking though they may be in authority, they yet march in step with the unfolding modern conspiracy of which they are a prophetic utterance.

Statesmen like Churchill and Lloyd George, writers like Belloc and Wickham Steed, and editors like H. A. Gwynne; Jews themselves of the calibre of Disraeli and Oscar Levy, have all contributed their testimony to the fact of Jewish power, of which there is now a vast accumulation of evidence.

What we have to watch is that the facts of this power are not derided or rejected as a result of devices such as that the B.B.C. gives a full hour to knocking down what is for all intents and purposes a skittle, but accords never a split second to those of us who would be competent to trace in actual policy the essential teachings, and many of the mechanisms embodied in the Protocols. If the desire to achieve objectivity animated Broadcasting House, would it not have taken care to ensure that the programme made provision for a dispassionate assessment of this curious relationship? But then, of course, Hugh Carleton Greene on behalf of the B.B.C. has disavowed the intention of an objective appraisal of Jewish matters. Another test is that not one national newspaper in the land dares to comment on the Carleton Greene dictum or to publish a single line critical of Jewry. Here, surely, is an established fact of power.

Zionism's Supreme End

Two other points are worth answering. The promoters of the B.B.C. programme were no doubt sincere, if ignorant, in putting forward the view that *"the Protocols contradict all that Zionism stands for, above all a national home of modest geographical pretensions for the Jewish people. Zionism was and still is hostile to international Jewry, which was vital to the non-existent Elders."* This, I submit, is nonsense. There is proof that the entire international machinery of Jewry was used to defeat the British Government's attempt to hold some kind of a ring for the Palestinian Arabs; and the United States Government, with virtually every European Government, including that of the Soviet Union, was suborned to this end. General Sir Frederick Morgan disclosed the misuse of UNRRA in the Zionist cause, and later — which may be considered significant — he revealed the Communist espionage network which muscled-in on UNRRA's organisational facilities. No doubt there are some Zionists for whom the State of Israel is the supreme end, but they are not among the more instructed. The informed bear in mind the messianic predictions of their race, and the unique international dispositions of World Jewry enable them the more effectively to press for the establishment of international agencies which they dominate, leading to World Government, which they also intend to dominate. It would be quite unbelievable for a people as astute as the Jews to possess and then leave it to rust for want of exercise. Here again we do not require the Protocols to instruct us.

The second point is this. Those who compiled the B.B.C. programme made the following unwarranted assertion:

"Accusations in ordinary politics are aimed at groups and peoples able to reply because they are real people. When a McCarthy refers to lists of highly-placed traitors who don't exist; when a Fascist demagogue refers to octopus-like conspiracies of un-named because imagined enemies; when weekly journalists try to make their readers' flesh creep with awful stories of conspiring bogey-men called The Establishment, and when forgers report fictitious meetings at which bloodthirsty and annihilating decisions are taken by mysterious and powerful beings, and when the evil of mass suspicion of one race by another is introduced by such means, then we are going far beyond the tussle of politics. Since the accused are non-existent, the defence is silent, and suspicion multiplies. We are opening dark places in the mind. We are exciting superstitions and instincts that lie deep in the human nature and which it is the purpose of civilisation to render harmless."

Did McCarthy in fact refer to lists of highly-placed traitors who did not exist? What Congressional records should we consult for the evidence? I do not know in what category Candour is placed, but it can scarcely be said that we fail to name those whose policies we attack. The motive behind the passage is clear enough. It is to suggest cowardice and delinquency in Gentile patriots who feel obliged to take a stand against Jewish power. The innuendo of cowardice we can laugh at, but the notion that it is the purpose of civilisation to *"render harmless"* our criticism should be considered in a more serious light. Jews have long cherished the ambition of making comments hostile to their influence illegal and in

some countries they have already succeeded. As might be expect, the Protocols, which provided for so much, provide also for this situation:

"In order to destroy the prestige of heroism for political crime, we shall send it for trial in the category of thieving, murder, and every kind of abominable and filthy crime. Public opinion will then confuse in its conception this category of crime with the disgrace attaching to every other and will brand it with the same contempt."

The Soviet Union has gone much further, making *"political crime"* (opposition to tyranny?) the worst of all the offences and placing political prisoners at the mercy of the most brutal criminals. Again we see that in more senses than one do events tend to catch up with, and overtake, the pronouncements of the *"Learned Elders"*. On those ground alone, to attempt to argue a case for the authenticity of the Protocols is a foolish endeavour. What cannot be dismissed as faked are the international policies which relentlessly push mankind into One World, and it is these policies, not the Protocols, upon which we should rely in our fight against the World Government to be.

All to be Controlled

Will Hugh Carleton Greene not allow us just twenty minutes on the air to explain the basis of that fight? Good heavens no! The truth would serve to make us free — and freedom forms no part of the design for the future governance of mankind. All is to be controlled, and the control will perhaps not be so very different from that foreseen by the mysterious *"Learned Elders of Zion"*, quite irrespective of whether they were the Sanhedrin or some gang of Gentile forgers inspired by prophecy.

Broadcasting House Replies

Our leading article in the issue of June 9 was a commentary on the recent B.B.C. programme which set out to prove that the document known as the *"Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"* was a forgery. I expressed our lack of interest in the origins of this strange work, and sought to focus attention instead on the extent to which its precepts have been, and are being, incorporated in internationalist policies, such as the drive towards World Government. And intermediate steps to destroy national sovereignty through merging national will in various functional bodies, which make possible the exercise of military control. I also pointed to the remarkable similarity between the teaching of the Protocols and the ordering of affairs in the Soviet Union, which came into being some years after their publication.

Both Sides

Last week the B.B.C. sent me a letter replying to some of the points made in my article, and for the sake of fairness, not wishing our readers to be made aware of only our own side of the

argument, this reply is published in full, together with my further comments. Signed by Mr. Christopher Sykes, it reads:

*"The British Broadcasting Corporation,
Broadcasting House,
London W.1.*

June 13, 1961

Dear Mr Chesterton,

I have read "Learned Elders and the B.B.C. " in Candour of June 9. I am the author of the broadcast script to which you take exception. Allow me to make a few observations on your article:

- 1. First I should point out that the programme was part of a series on fakes and forgeries. The choice of subject indicated an interest in forgeries in general, not any special preoccupation with "The Protocols". There was no Jewish pressure behind the choice of subject. I am not a Jew, nor is the producer or general editor of the series, nor is the head of the B.B.C. department in which I work.*
- 2. As regards the assertion of forgery by two Swiss courts, I own that I have not looked up official records but have been guided by reports by independent authorities (not Jewish ones by the bye). I have understood that as regarding forgery the finding of the first court was upheld by the Court of Appeal while not allowing that "The Protocols" may be classed as obscene literature. If they did reject the conclusions of both sides, I take it that they did so as a matter of legal form, but not in consideration of the weight of evidence.*
- 3. You say that most students of the Jewish question reject the conclusions of both sides. I do not think they would so if they studied the matter for any length of time.*
- 4. It is distressing to find that Sir Winston Churchill was once deceived by the notion that the Bolshevik Revolution was primarily a Jewish affair, but not wholly surprising. Other eminent statesmen, besides that great man, were under this impression at the time. Appearances were deceptive. Later events have shown the absurdity of confounding Communism and Jewry. The Jews seem to have had little influence under Stalin who died, if the accounts of his last illness are authentic, in a somewhat anti-Semitic mood.*

5. Those who find *"The Protocols of the Elders"* credible are, I believe, suffering from a state of mind describable as *"muddle through simplicity"*. There are many shrewd political comments in *"The Protocols"*, and yet more in the original *Joly*, from which they were copied. Many Governments, many parties, many groups of men have been guilty of many of the abominations in which the *"Elders"* exulted, and I suppose that, to date, Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party have been more guilty of more of these crimes in one regime than any other of the thousands of agents of evil of whom we have record. The childish thing about *"The Protocols"*, as about *Joly's* satire on Napoleon III, is to ascribe all these crimes to one agency. One sees the same *"muddle through simplicity"* in some Marxist propaganda: all history as a banker's plot. I believe that the first person to play this game was the Abbe Barruel who furnished *"proof"* that the French Revolution was exclusively the result of a Free Mason plot!

6. When I said in the *"closing speech for the prosecution"* that it was the duty of civilisation to tame certain dark impulses of the mind, I was not implying that all criticism should be silenced, but that it was iniquitous to obtain a following by arousing irrational hatreds, to which most men can be prone.

If you choose to publish this letter you may, but if so I would ask you to publish it in full.

Yours Sincerely,

(Signed) Christopher Sykes"

Mr. Sykes's letter is courteous and sincere but not at all well informed. I will reply to his points as he numbers them.

(1) Noted and accepted without comment, except as to enquire whether Mr. Sykes's services were utilized as those of an expert on *"forgeries in general"* or as those of an expert on Jewish problems.

(2) Why does Mr. Sykes not name his *"independent authorities"*? As they have fed him with wrong information, how much trust does he still repose in them? I cannot compete in thought-reading about what was in the mind of the Appeal Court, but prefer to believe that it meant what it said.

(3) The desideratum, as Point 2 would suggest, would seem to be not length of study but exactness of scholarship!

(4) How does it come about that Winston Churchill was deceived about the Bolshevik Revolution, that M. Oudendyk, Netherlands Ambassador at Petrograd (now Leningrad) during the Bolshevik Revolution, was deceived, that the late Wickham Steed, former editor

of The Times, was deceived, that Sisson, the American diplomat in Moscow during the Revolution, was deceived, and that the world had had to await the unsupported statement of Mr. Christopher Sykes to learn about this deception?

It would be illuminating to discover whether Mr. Sykes has ever read the report of M Oudendyk, dated Sept. 6, 1918, and published as a White Paper by the British Government. I quote from it: *"I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the War, which is still raging, and unless, as above stated, Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over the whole world, as it is organised and worked by Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."* In what way does Mr. Sykes claim to be a better informed person about the Bolshevik Revolution than was M. Oudendyk?

Continued Support

I agree with Mr. Sykes that most of the Jews originally associated with Lenin and Trotsky later lost out to Stalin and went down in his successive purges. Curiously, however, this fact did not lead to the disenchantment of many Jews elsewhere, who continued to support Communist causes from almost impregnable positions in the United States, notably during the Second World War, and who were active in the leadership of the Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain after the war. I also agree with Mr. Sykes about the absurdity of confounding Communism and Jewry. They should never be confounded, which is not to deny the prodigious role played by Jews in the inspiration and promotion of Communism. If Mr. Sykes is still sceptical, he should ask himself what the Jewish Chronicle meant when it wrote on April 4, 1919: *"There is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in that fact the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism"*.

(5) I understand, and sympathise with, Mr. Sykes's statement of his belief that those who find the Protocols credible suffer from a state of mind describable as *"muddle through simplicity"*. To suppose that any single document furnishes the key to immensely complicated political patterns is, to say the least, naïve. But that does not necessarily invalidate whatever there is in the document which is germane to the present world situation. We have to admit that the tendency of the human mind is to oversimplify the problems that confront it, although I confess that few people irritate me more than the person who says: *"Once you have read the Protocols you understand everything"*. The man capable of making that remark is incapable, I venture to think, of understanding much about anything. Nevertheless, although a candle cannot illuminate the entire empire of the night, it is sometimes a useful thing to have in the house.

The reference to Joly's *"satire on Napoleon III"* is misleading, because there is nothing satirical in the Protocols. Napoleon the Third's scope and powers were circumscribed, whereas the potency of World Jewry lies in its position of power in many lands and the fearful dimensions of this power when it is internationally organized. It is childish, as Mr.

Sykes says, to ascribe all the world's evil to "*one agency*": the affairs of mankind are far too involved and complicated to permit of so facile a diagnosis. But if one kind of policy is pursued through the year it is logical to look for the existence of an activating agency dedicated to that purpose. I set no store by the fact that the shadowy "*Learned Elders*" are regarded by some as constituting just such a cabal, but I do set store by statements such as those of Churchill, Oudendyk, Wickham Steed, and the Jewish Chronicle concerning the fact of Bolshevism, as I set store by the passage about Jewish power in general: "*The influence of the Jews may be traced in the last outbreak of the destructive principle in Europe [1848 — A.K.C.]. An insurrection takes place against tradition and aristocracy, against religion and property. Destruction of the Semitic principle, extirpation of the Jewish religion, whether in the Mosaic or the Christian form, the natural equality of men and the abrogation of property are proclaimed by the Secret Societies which form Provisional Governments, and men of Jewish Race are found at the head of every one of them. The people of God co-operate with atheists, the most skilful accumulators of property ally themselves with Communists; the peculiar and chosen Race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe; and all this because they wish to destroy that ungrateful Christianity which owes to them even its name, and whose tyranny they can no longer endure.*" The author of that passage was Benjamin Disraeli and it occurs in *The Life of Lord George Bentinck*. Mr. Sykes would scarcely argue that Disraeli was also "*deceived*". I believe that Mr. Sykes as an honest man will admit the Protocols savour of the quotation, as of many more that could be taken from the works of Disraeli. My chief complaint about his B.B.C. programme is that it never even hinted at the undoubted spiritual relationship of such facts with the pretensions attributed to the "*Learned Elders*".

Ancient Propaganda!

Mr. Sykes tells us that he sees the same "*muddle through simplicity*" in Marxist propaganda which interprets all history as a banker's plot. The propaganda must be incredibly ancient, as I have never encountered it during the thirty years I have been giving my attention to these questions. As international bankers of New York, with their Hamburg and Paris affiliates, financed the Bolshevik Revolution, I would have been astonished had I ever read a Marxist attack on finance-capitalism, as distinct from industrial-capitalism. Sisson is only one of several witnesses about the finding by bankers of the money for the Bolsheviks. I quote from his official report to the U.S. government, a letter written in September, 1917, by J. Furstenberg (later under another name a member of the Soviet government) to one Raphael Scholan:

"Dear Comrade,

The office of the Banking House M. Warburg has opened in accordance with telegram from president of Rheinisch-Westphalian Syndicate an account for the undertaking of Comrade Trotsky. The attorney purchased arms and has organised their transportation and delivery up to Luleo and Vardi. Name to the office in Essen and Son in Luleo, receivers, and a person authorised to receive the money demanded by Comrade Trotsky.

J. Furstenberg."

Max Warburg was a Hamburg banker, the brother of Paul and Felix Warburg, of the Wall Street firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., in which they were partners of Jacob Schiff, who later admitted having financed the overthrow of the Czar. Does nothing of all this suggest to the B.B.C. at least something of the claims of the "*Learned Elders*"?

(6) I agree with all my heart that it is "*iniquitous to obtain a following by arousing irrational hatreds*", although I would dispute Mr. Sykes' contention that most men can be prone to them. There are people who deplore the proved machinations of Financial Jewry, just as there are people who deplore the invasion of our land by coloured migrants. But to deplore is not the same thing as to hate. I am convinced that for the most part hatred, whether irrational or otherwise, is a matter of propinquity. Hatred of and by Jews (or of and by coloured people) is greatest in those areas where they are most closely packed together: in areas where they seldom if ever come into contact very few take any interest in the others' existence. As for those of us who actively oppose the international influence of Jews, as we oppose the coloured influx, I perhaps speak with some authority when I say that the hate-merchant when encountered is the biggest of our liabilities and (if we know our job) the one whose going from our midst we lose no time in expediting. Mr. Sykes will perhaps accept my assurance that a reading of the "*Learned Elders*" does not normally incite hatred and that in any event we are the first to dub as lunatics those who attempt to argue our case on the basis of the authenticity of the Protocols, strange, disturbing and well worth reading though they be.

Candour has here given the B.B.C. the hospitality of its space to set forth its views in full. How long will it be before Mr. Hugh Carleton Greene, Director-General of the B.B.C., returns the compliment by giving me the opportunity of presenting my own views, as here outlined, at a peak (or any other) listening period?

Postscript

That, so far as the British Broadcasting Corporation was concerned, was the end of the matter. No invitation to the writer of this pamphlet to broadcast was seriously expected and none has been received, while Mr. Sykes was unable to reply further or has been restrained by Broadcasting House.

The refusal of this vast Corporation to allow the other side to be heard was also shown in the letter sent by its Solicitor to Mr. A. W. Gittens, of the Britons Publishing Company (which had been mentioned as the original publishers of the Protocols in the United Kingdom) wherein the B.B.C. declined to make the script available on the grounds — not established by experience — that it is not the Corporation's practice to provide scripts. Fortunately a private recording had been made and served the same purpose.

ooo